

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 18-21 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat et al. (US 2003/138008) (hereinafter "Riazat") in view of Spangler (US 5,547,385) (hereinafter "Spangler"), and further in view of Patrick, Jr. (US 3,767,971) (hereinafter "Patrick, Jr.").

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Spangler and further in view of Kjarsgarrrd (US 3,972,356) (hereinafter "Kjarasgarrrd") and Patrick, Jr.

Claims 1, 3 and 4

Claim 1 recites: "...a ground connector having an end that is acutely shaped compared to an end of the least one active connector..." As in previous Office Actions, Patrick, Jr. is relied on to show this feature of claim 1. In the "Response to Arguments" section on page two of the Office Action, the Examiner notes that although the intended use of Patrick, Jr. is not directed towards optoelectronics, it is clear that the beneficial shape disclosed is useful, and analogous, when dealing with charge dissipation and ESD applications.

In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, it is respectfully submitted that an invention is not obvious where old or well known elements solve a different problem. See, for example, *Lindermann Mashinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Such is the case of the present invention as recited in claim 1. The Examiner concedes that the disclosure of Patrick, Jr. is not related to optoelectronics. The disclosure of Patrick, Jr. relates to a static bleed resistor for the prevention of the buildup of an electrostatic charge on a insulated conducting body, or in other words, a resistor that is large enough so that it has no practical effect on the circuit but still permits any stray charge, such as a lightning strike, to bleed to ground. The dimensions of the static bleed resistors contemplated in Patrick, Jr. are between 8 and 10 inches long.

By contrast, the ground connector of claim 1 is for a laser diode of an optical pickup. The scale and application of the acutely shaped ground connector of claim 1 is much different from the static bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr., which is designed to protect a conducting body from repeated lightning strikes. As such, it is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation to combine the conically shaped bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr. to the ground connector of claim 1 because the two features of these two separate inventions solve different problems and a combination of old elements does not negate patentability.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10

Claim 6 recites: "...wherein an end of the protruding portion of the ground connector is acutely shaped compared to an end of the protruding portion of the at least one active connector." It is respectfully submitted that this technical feature of claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art.

Claims 7, 9 and 10 depend from claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 18-21

Claim 18 recites: "...the ground connector is at least longer than the at least one active connector and more acutely shaped than the at least one active connector." It is respectfully submitted that this technical feature of claim 18 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art.

Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Jan 4, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Seventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501